

TABLE OF CONTENTS

page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	i
ABSTRACT	ii
ABSTRAK	iii
ABBREVIATIONS	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
LIST OF FIGURES	xi
LIST OF TABLES	xiii

CHAPTER 1 THE ROLE OF VEGETATION ON SLOPE STABILITY

1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.2 Literature Review	
1.2.1 Slope Instability.....	2
1.2.2 Vegetation And Slope Stability: Water Relations and Root Reinforcement.....	3
1.2.3 Influence of Vegetation Type.....	7
1.3 Philosophy and Objectives : Monoculture vs. Mix-culture.....	7
1.4 Screening of the Species of Shrubs.....	9

CHAPTER 2 PLANT SCREENING : ROOT LENGTH DENSITY

2.1 Introduction.....	11
2.2 Materials and Methods	
2.2.1 Plant Materials.....	11
2.2.2 Measurements.....	12
2.3 Results and Discussion	
2.3.1 Photosynthesis, Transpiration Rates, and Stomatal Conductance.....	13
2.3.2 Root Length Density (RLD).....	15
2.3.3 Water Absorption Capacity (WAC).....	18
2.3.4 Dry Weight Partitioning and Biomass.....	21
2.3.5 Root/Shoot Ratio.....	21
2.3.6 Correlation between RLD and Physiological	

Parameters	24
2.4 General Discussion	27

CHAPTER 3 PLANT SCREENING: DROUGHT STRESS

3.1 Introduction	28
3.2 Materials and Methods	
3.2.1 Plant Culture	28
3.2.2 Water Stress Treatment	29
3.2.3 Measurements	29
3.3 Results and Discussion	
3.3.1 Species Performance	30
3.3.2 Visual Observations	32
3.3.3 Leaf Water Potential	34
3.3.4 Relationship of Stomatal Conductance and Leaf Water Potential	34
3.3.5 Influence on Leaf Water Potential on Photosynthesis Rate	34
3.3.6 Photosynthesis Rates and Stomatal Conductance	38
3.3.7 Transpiration Rates and Stomatal Conductance	38
3.3.8 Recovery from Water Stress	38
3.3.9 The Effects of Water Stress on Leaf Area	42
3.4 General Discussion	47

CHAPTER 4 FIELD EXPERIMENT: PLANT WATER RELATIONS OF SHRUB ON SLOPES

4.1 Introduction	48
4.2 Materials and Methods	
4.2.1 Plant Materials	49
4.2.2 Experimental Design	49
4.2.3 Measurements	49
4.3 Results and Discussion	
4.3.1 Water Relations of the Shrubs	
(a) Photosynthesis Rate	52
(b) Transpiration Rates	52

(c) Stomatal Conductance	55
(d) Water Use Efficiency (WUE)	56
4.3.2 Gross Measurement of the Shrubs	
(a) Leaf Area Per Plant	56
(b) Dry Weight Partitioning and Above Ground Biomass	58
4.4 General Discussion	61

CHAPTER 5 SURVEY ON SOIL WATER AND ROOT PROFILES OF SLOPES ALONG THE NORTH-SOUTH EXPRESSWAY

5.1 Introduction	64
5.2 Materials and Methods	
5.2.1 Description of the Sites	64
5.2.2 Measurements	66
5.3 Results and Discussion	
5.3.1 Root Length Density (RLD)	67
5.3.2 Soil Water Content (SWC)	71
5.3.3 Penetrability	74
5.3.4 Shear Strength	74
5.4 General Discussion	77

CHAPTER 6 FIELD EXPERIMENT: MONOCULTURE V/S. MIX-CULTURE

6.1 Introduction	83
6.2 Materials and Methods	
6.2.1 Plant Materials	83
6.2.2 "Bush Ecosystem" Experiment	84
6.2.3 Experimental Design	84
6.2.4 Measurements	84
6.3 Results and Discussion	
6.3.1 Physiological Performance of the Shrubs	
(a) Photosynthesis Rate	87
(b) Transpiration Rate	88
(c) Leaf Area Index (LAI)	88

(d) Shrubs Performance in the Mix-culture - December 1996 vs. December 1997	89
(e) Component of Photosynthesis	
(i) Light Response Curve	89
(ii) Carbon Dioxide Response Curves (ACa and ACi)	91
6.3.2 Performance of the Plant Community	
(a) Leaf Area Index (LAI)	96
(b) Diversity	96
(c) Biomass	99
(d) Relationship between Diversity and Biomass	100
6.3.3 Stability of the Slopes	
(a) RLD on the Slopes	100
(b) Soil Penetrability	104
(c) Shear Strength	106
(d) Soil Water Content (SWC)	106
6.4 General Discussion	109

CHAPTER 7 VEGETATION AND SLOPE STABILISATION – AN EPILOGUE

7.1 Introduction	114
7.2 Vegetation Role on Slope Stability	114
7.3 Plant Screening : 3 Ways of Selection	115
7.4 “Bush” Ecosystem Model	115
7.5 Contribution of the Project	116
7.6 Challenge and Conflict of Interest	116
7.7 Conclusion	117

BIBLIOGRAPHY	119
--------------------	-----

APPENDIX 1	127
------------------	-----

APPENDIX 2	128
------------------	-----

APPENDIX 3	129
------------------	-----

APPENDIX 4	130
APPENDIX 5	131
APPENDIX 6	132
APPENDIX 7	134
APPENDIX 8	137

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Fig. 2.1 : Physiological criteria of 5 species in (a) photosynthesis rate (b) transpiration rate (c) stomatal conductance.....	14
Fig. 2.2 : Root profile 5 species of shrubs.....	17
Fig. 2.3 : Dry weight partitioning of the shrubs studied.....	23
Fig. 3.1 : Relationship between stomatal conductance and leaf water potential.....	36
Fig. 3.2 : Relationship between photosynthesis rate and leaf water potential.....	37
Fig. 3.3 : Relationship between photosynthesis rate and stomatal conductance.....	39
Fig. 3.4 : Relationship between transpiration rate and stomatal conductance.....	40
Fig. 3.5 : Photosynthesis rates in well-watered and water-stressed shrubs.....	41
Fig. 3.6 : Transpiration rates in well-watered and water-stressed shrubs.....	43
Fig. 3.7 : WUE in well-watered and water-stressed shrubs.....	44
Fig. 3.8 : RWC in well-watered and water-stressed shrubs.....	45
Fig. 3.9 : Leaf area of well-watered and water-stressed of the plant studied.....	46
Fig. 4.1 : Comparison of stomatal conductance between controlled and pre-treated shrubs.....	54
Fig. 4.2 : Comparison of leaf area per plant of the shrubs studied between controlled and pre-treated shrubs.....	57
Fig. 4.3 : Comparison of biomass of the shrubs studied between controlled and pre- treatments shrubs.....	60
Fig. 5.1 : Root length density of the NSE slopes	69
Fig. 5.2 : Soil water content of the NSE slopes.....	72
Fig. 5.3 : Penetrability of the NSE slopes.....	75
Fig. 5.4 : Relationship between penetrability (MPa) and SWC (%).....	78

Fig. 5.5	: Relationship between penetrability (MPa) and RLD (km m^{-3}).....	79
Fig. 5.6	: Relationship between SWC (%) and shear strength (kPa).....	81
Fig. 5.7	: Relationship between shear strength (kPa) and RLD (km m^{-3}).....	82
Fig. 6.1	: Six plots at the experimental slope.....	86
Fig. 6.2	: Performance of the shrubs in the mix-culture treatment (December 1996 – December 1997).....	90
Fig. 6.3	: Carbon response curve (ACa) of the species studied.....	94
Fig. 6.4	: Carbon response curve (ACi) of the species studied.....	95
Fig. 6.5	: Biomass of the plots studied at FSKTM.....	101
Fig. 6.6	: Relationship between biomass and diversity of the plots studied.....	102
Fig. 6.7	: Root length density of 6 plots studied at FSKTM slopes.....	103
Fig. 6.8	: Penetrability of the soil at FSKTM slopes.....	105
Fig. 6.9	: Soil water content of FSKTM slopes.....	108
Fig. 6.10	: Relationship between penetrability (MPa) and SWC (%).....	110
Fig. 6.11	: Relationship between penetrability (MPa) and RLD (km m^{-3}).....	111
Fig. 6.12	: Relationship between SWC (%) and shear strength (kPa).....	112
Fig. 6.13	: Relationship between shear strength (kPa) and RLD (km m^{-3}).....	113
Fig. 7.1	: The negative and positive interaction among some of the parameters studied.....	118

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1.1 : Beneficial effects of vegetation and grasses on slopes stability (Gray, 1995).....	4
Table 1.2 : Hydro-mechanical influences of woody vegetation on slopes stability (Greenway, 1987).....	5
Table 1.3 : The values of nutrients measured at different soil samplings (Rosli <i>et al.</i> , 1994).....	6
Table 1.4 : Plant types for different functions and applications (Coppin <i>et al.</i> , 1990).....	8
Table 1.5 : Introduction to the species of the shrubs studied (Graf, 1992)	10
Table 2.1 : Correlation coefficient between (a) photosynthesis rates and stomatal conductance and (b) transpiration rates and stomatal conductance of 5 species of the shrubs studied	16
Table 2.2 : Root length density of the 5 species studied.....	19
Table 2.3 : Water absorption capacity of root in the 5 species of shrubs studied	20
Table 2.4 : Biomass of stem, leaf, and root, total root length and total leaf area of 5 species of shrubs (each value represents the mean of 6 determinations except total root length).....	22
Table 2.5 : Root/Shoot ratio of the species studied (2 ways). Each value represents the mean of 6 determinations.....	25
Table 2.6 : Correlation coefficients of other physiological parameters and RLD (n=6).....	26
Table 3.1 : Species performance at the beginning and the end of the treatment (n=7-10) Highlighted species was much affected by the stress.....	31
Table 3.2 : Visual observations of 4 species during the water-stressed treatment within 40 days (n=7-10).....	33
Table 3.3 : Leaf water potential of the species during the experiment (W=well-watered, S=water-stressed) with n=7-10.....	35

	Page
Table 4.1 : The physiological parameters studied during the pre-stressed treatment (n=10).....	50
Table 4.2 : Description of the experimental plot.....	51
Table 4.3 : Comparison of performance of the shrubs in controlled and pre-treated shrubs in December 1997. Each value represents the mean of 6-10 replications.....	53
Table 4.4 : Dry weight partitioning of the shrubs studied in the two treatments.....	59
Table 4.5 : Overall results of plant water relations and gross parameters studies of the pre-treated shrubs as compared to the controlled shrubs. (↑ = significantly higher than the control, ↓ = significantly lower than the control and N.S. = not significant).....	63
Table 5.1 : Description of the slopes.....	65
Table 5.2 : Information of the measurements on slopes.....	68
Table 5.3 : Root profile of 5 type of slopes.....	70
Table 5.4 : Soil water content and field capacity ()* of the slopes studied.....	73
Table 5.5 : Shear strength value (kPa) at 4 inches of soil depth of the NSE slopes (n = 8).....	76
Table 6.1 : Description of the plots.....	85
Table 6.2 : Some parameters related to photosynthesis components of the species studied.....	92
Table 6.3 : Plant performance in terms of Leaf Area Index (LAI) of the plant community in December 1997.....	97
Table 6.4 : The percentage of increment in diversity at the experimental plots from December 1996 to December 1997 (summarisation of Appendix 6 and 7).....	98
Table 6.5 : Shear strength value (kPa) of the plots studied at FSKTM slopes.....	107